



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231
www.uspto.gov

6

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/363,311	07/28/1999	DANIEL WATKINS	5201-16300/P	7985

24319 7590 06/20/2002

LSI Logic Corporation
1551 McCarthy Blvd.
M/S: D-106 Patent Department
Milpitas, CA 95035

EXAMINER

BARAN, MARY C

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2857

DATE MAILED: 06/20/2002

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/363,311

Applicant(s)

WATKINS, DANIEL

Examiner

Mary Kate Baran

Art Unit

2857

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 9 August 2001.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-20 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-20 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☒ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
- If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
- a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) _____
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other:

DETAILED ACTION

Specification

1. The abstract of the disclosure is objected to because it exceeds 150 words.

Correction is required. See MPEP § 608.01(b).

The disclosure is objected to because of the following informalities: referring to page 11 reference character "324" is used to describe both a "coverage management module" (lines 22-23) and "coverage parameters" (line 25).

Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

1. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent, or on an international application by another who has fulfilled the requirements of paragraphs (1), (2), and (4) of section 371(c) of this title before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent.

The changes made to 35 U.S.C. 102(e) by the American Inventors Protection Act of 1999 (AIPA) do not apply to the examination of this application as the application being examined was not (1) filed on or after November 29, 2000, or (2) voluntarily published under 35 U.S.C. 122(b). Therefore, this application is examined under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) prior to the amendment by the AIPA (pre-AIPA 35 U.S.C. 102(e)).

Claims 1-5, 11-13 and 17-19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Kurosaka et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,949,691).

Referring to claim 1, Kurosaka et al. discloses a system for device verification (Fig. 1, i.e. logic circuit verification device 100) comprising; a profile generation module (Fig. 1, i.e. data input unit 101) configured to provide a pattern profile (Fig. 1, i.e. intermediate format data file 106) that represents a test pattern, wherein the aspects are specified by a profile mode (see col. 8 lines 34-40), a coverage measurement module (Fig. 1, i.e. corresponding point detection section 102) configured to process the pattern profile (Fig. 1, i.e. intermediate format data file 106) to produce analysis results indicative of coverage provided by the test pattern, wherein the profile generation module (Fig. 1, i.e. data input unit 101) is further configured to process the analysis results to provide an improved pattern profile (see col. 9 lines 31-40), and a pattern generation module (Fig. 1, i.e. corresponding point detection section 102) configured to receive the improved pattern profile and to convert the improved pattern profile into a test pattern for verifying device performance (see col. 8 lines 41-49).

Referring to claim 2, Kurosaka et al. discloses a coverage measurement module which is configured to determine coverage of the test pattern by ascertaining if node faults are detectable, wherein node faults are detectable if running the test pattern on a device would indicate a failure (see col. 11 lines 47-55 and col. 11 line 60 – col. 12 line 4).

Referring to claim 3, Kurosaka et al. discloses a coverage measurement module which ascertains if node faults are detectable for those nodes in a first category and wherein the coverage of measurement module ignores those nodes in a second category. Where the nodes are categorized in the correspondence rules by logic type

(see col. 8 lines 14-15) and the correspondence rules can then be used to select which nodes can be tested (see col. 7 lines 41-44).

Referring to claim 4, Kurosaka et al. discloses a system further comprising a test pattern profiling module configured to convert an existing test pattern into a pattern profile as specified by a profile mode (see col. 7 lines 38-49).

Referring to claim 5, Kurosaka et al. discloses a system further comprising a pattern checking module configured to process the pattern profile to produce analysis results indicative of whether the test pattern complies with a specified rule (see col. 10 lines 15-20).

Referring to claim 11, Kurosaka et al. discloses a system for verifying device design that includes functional modules (Fig. 1, i.e. logic circuit verification device 100), wherein the system comprises; a profile generation means (Fig. 1, i.e. data input unit 101) for providing a pattern profile (Fig. 1, i.e. intermediate format data file 106) that represents a test pattern, wherein the pattern profile includes an intelligible description of aspects of the test pattern, wherein the aspects are specified by a profile mode (see col. 8 lines 34-41), a coverage measurement means (Fig. 1, i.e. corresponding point detection section 102) for analyzing the pattern profile to produce analysis results indicative of coverage provided by the test pattern, wherein the profile generation means is further configured to process the analysis results to provide an improved pattern profile (see col. 9 lines 31-40), and a pattern generation means for converting the improved pattern profile into a test pattern (see col. 8 lines 42-50).

Referring to claim 12, Kurosaka et al. discloses a coverage measurement means which is configured to determine the coverage of the test pattern by ascertaining if node faults are detectable (see col. 11 line 60-64).

Referring to claim 13, Kurosaka et al. discloses a test pattern profiling means for converting an existing test pattern into a pattern profile (see col. 7 lines 38-49).

Referring to claim 17, Kurosaka et al. discloses a method for verifying a device design comprising the steps; analyzing a test pattern profile to determine coverage of a test pattern (see col. 10 lines 62-63), generating a second profile for an improved test pattern that provides better coverage (see col. 10 lines 63-67), converting the second profile into the improved test pattern (see col. 10 line 67 – col. 11 line 1) and running the improved test pattern on a simulated device (see col. 11 lines 2-3).

Referring to claim 18, Kurosaka et al. discloses a method where the test pattern profile includes an intelligible representation of aspects of the test pattern, and where the aspects are specified by the profile module (see col. 7 lines 38-41).

Referring to claim 19, Kurosaka et al. discloses a method where one aspect specified by the profile mode is a subset of input signals that represent instructions (see col. 7 lines 49-53).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

2. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 6, 8, 9, 14, 16, and 20 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kurosaka et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,949,691), in view of McNamara et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,141,630).

Referring to claim 6, as noted above Kurosaka et al. teaches all but a pattern generation module which is coupled to run the test pattern on a device-under-test that implements at least a portion of a device design.

McNamara et al. discloses a test generator which generates a set of test vectors that are then sent to a simulated design which models the operational characteristics of the circuit design (see col. 3 lines 40-43 and col. 3 lines 47-50).

It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art to modify Kurosaka et al. to further include the teachings of McNamara et al. to thoroughly test the simulated device design.

Referring to claim 8, Kurosaka et al. and McNamara et al. disclose all but a device design which includes functional modules each having module input signals and module output signals.

McNamara et al. discloses a simulated design which receives test vectors (i.e. input signals) and generates output data (see col. 3 lines 43-47).

It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art to modify Kurosaka et al. to further include the teachings of McNamara to test the specified modules more efficiently.

Art Unit: 2857

Referring to claim 9, Kurosaka et al. and McNamara et al., as noted above, disclose all but a profile which includes a human-intelligible representation of a test pattern for one of the functional modules. Kurosaka et al. further discloses a data file which stores a detailed representation of the circuit information (see col.7 lines 6-9).

Referring to claim 14, Kurosaka et al. discloses all but a pattern generation means coupled to run a test pattern on a device simulation means that implements at least a portion of a device design.

McNamara et al. discloses a test generator which generates a set of test vectors that are then sent to a simulated design. This simulated design includes software, which then models the operational characteristics of the circuit design (see col. 3 lines 40-43 and col. 3 lines 47-50).

It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art to modify Kurosaka et al. to further include the teachings of McNamara et al. to ensure a complete test of the design.

Referring to claim 16, Kurosaka et al. and McNamara et al. disclose all but a device design which includes functional modules each having module input signals and module output signals, and wherein the profile includes an intelligible representation of a test pattern for one of the functional modules.

McNamara et al. discloses a simulated design which receives test vectors (i.e. input signals) and generates output data (see col. 3 lines 43-47), where a test generator

Art Unit: 2857

generates test vectors based on a design description (see col. 4 lines 38-39) coded in a known design language (see col. 3 lines 22-24).

It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Kurosaka et al. to further include the teachings of McNamara et al. to generate a more understandable process of the device design.

Referring to claim 20, Kurosaka et al. discloses all but a method wherein one aspect specified by the profile mode is a set of input signals for a functional sub-module of the device design.

McNamara et al. discloses a circuit design which is coded in a known software language and sent to a test generator which generates a set of test vectors that are then sent to a simulated design, which includes software, and this software then models the operational characteristics of the circuit design (see col. 3 lines 40-43 and col. 3 lines 47-50).

It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art to modify Kurosaka et al. to further include the teachings of McNamara to ensure specific and relevant inputs to aid in detecting specific faults in the circuit design.

3. Claims 7 and 15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kurosaka et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,949,691), in view of McNamara et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,141,630) and further in view of Valind (U.S. Patent No. 5,684,808).

Referring to claim 7, as noted above Kurosaka et al. and McNamara et al. teach all but a device design which has a set of interesting input signals and a set of customary input signals, wherein the profile includes a human-intelligible representation of the set of interesting input signals, and wherein the profile does not include any representation of the set of customary input signals.

Valind further discloses an automatic test pattern generator which is coupled to the detailed description (i.e. profile) and uses this information to generate test patterns for testing an integrated circuit (see col. 8 lines 1-5), and a test generation function which automatically generates a test pattern to test for a determined fault (see col. 11 lines 47-54).

It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art to modify Kurosaka et al. and McNamara et al. to further include the teachings of Valind to efficiently test all aspects of the circuit design.

Referring to claim 15, Kurosaka et al. and McNamara et al. discloses all but a device design which has a first set of input signals and a second distinct set of input signals, wherein the profile includes an intelligible representation of the first set of input signals and wherein the profile does not include any representation of the second set of input signals.

Valind further discloses an automatic test pattern generator which is coupled to the detailed description (i.e. profile) and uses this information to generate test patterns for testing an integrated circuit (see col. 8 lines 1-5), and a test generation function

Art Unit: 2857

which automatically generates a test pattern to test for a determined fault (see col. 11 lines 47-54).

It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art to modify Kurosaka et al. and McNamara et al. to further include the teachings of Valind to specify the device design input to match the design needs.

4. Claim 10 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kurosaka et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,949,691), in view of Valind (U.S. Patent No. 5,684,808).

Referring to claim 10, Kurosaka et al. discloses all but a profile generation module which is configurable to generate sequential permutations of values to specify pattern profiles.

Valind teaches test patterns which are generated using an automatic test pattern generator and then fault simulated to determine the faults detected by the given pattern (see col. 10 lines 30-37).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Kurosaka et al. to further include the teachings of Valind to ensure that all possible or relevant fault scenarios are covered.

Conclusion

5. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

Udell, Jr. discloses a method for designing a scan path for a logic circuit and testing of the same of particular interest.

Adams et al. discloses a method and apparatus for managing multimedia data files in a computer network by streaming data files into separate streams based on file attributes of particular interest.

Barouch et al. discloses a method and apparatus for verifying microcircuit fabrication procedure of particular interest.

Malka et al. discloses a coverage measurement tool for user defined coverage models of particular interest.

Witte et al. discloses a sampling technique for waveform measuring instruments of particular interest.

Sasaki et al. discloses a method for designing semiconductor integrated circuit and automatic designing device of particular interest.

Grundmann et al. discloses a method for analyzing manufacturing test pattern coverage of critical circuit delay circuit paths of particular interest.

Carpenter et al. discloses a method for partitioning logic designs for automatic test pattern generation based on logical registers of particular interest.

Pierce et al. discloses a register transfer level based scan insertion for integrated circuit design processes of particular interest.

5. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Mary Kate Baran whose telephone number is (703)305-

Art Unit: 2857

4474. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday - Friday from 8:00 am to 5:00 pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Marc S Hoff can be reached on (703) 308-1677. The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are (703)746-4045 for regular communications and (703)305-7382 for After Final communications.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 308-1782.

MKB
May 6, 2002


MARC S. HOFF
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2800